arXiv:1504.08016v2 [math.FA] 8 Nov 2016

On the relationship between three classes of operators on Riesz spaces

Liang Hong
Department of Mathematics
Robert Morris University
Moon Township, PA 15108, USA

November 9, 2016

Abstract

Following several papers in the prior literature, we study the relationship between order bounded operators, topologically bounded operators and topologically continuous operators. We give conditions for (i) the space of topologically continuous operators to be an ideal of the space of order bounded operators; this result generalizes the Nakano-Roberts Theorem; (ii) the space of topologically continuous operators to be a band of the space of order bounded operators; (iii) the space of order bounded operators to coincide with the space of topologically bounded operators; (iv) the space of order bounded operators to coincide with the space of topologically continuous operators. In addition, a set of counterexamples are given; these counterexamples are interesting in their own rights and contribute to the literature.

2010 MSC: Primary 47B60, 47B65; Secondary 46A40, 06B30, 06F30.

Keywords and phrases: Locally solid Riesz spaces; order bounded operators; regular operators; topologically bounded operators; topologically continuous operators.

1 Introduction

The relationship between order bounded operators and order continuous operators on Riesz spaces has been investigated in [1], [2] and [15]. This paper aims to further study the relationship between order bounded operators, topologically bounded operators and topologically continuous operators on Riesz spaces. Our starting point is the Nakano-Roberts Theorem which says that the norm dual of a locally solid Riesz space is an ideal of its order dual. It is natural to ask whether this result still holds for linear operators between two ordered topological vector spaces E_1 and E_2. To this end, we first ask whether the space $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ of topologically continuous operators is a vector subspace of the space $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$ of order bounded operators. We show by counterexamples that the answer is negative. Next, we seek a condition for $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ to be a vector subspace of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. Then we generalize the Nakano-Roberts Theorem by giving the condition for $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ to be an ideal of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$.

Following our Generalized Nakano-Roberts Theorem, we pose the question: whether the hypothesis of our Generalized Nakano-Roberts Theorem can ensure that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is a band of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. We point out that the answer to this question is again negative; indeed, in this case, $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ need not even be a σ-ideal of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. Then we give a condition for $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ to be a band of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$.

Next, we seek conditions for the space $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$ to coincide with the space $\mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$ of topologically bounded operators and conditions for $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$ to coincide with $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$. These results combined together yield conditions for $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$, the space $\mathcal{L}_R(E_1, E_2)$ of regular operators, $\mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ to coincide at the same time. This further leads to several interesting results: under suitable conditions, each positive operator is topologically continuous, each topologically continuous can be written as the difference of two positive operators, and so on.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides some preliminaries. Section 3 generalizes the Nakano-Roberts Theorem. Section 3 gives conditions for $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ to be a band of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. Section 4 further investigates the relationship between $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$, $\mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$.

2 Preliminaries

For notation, terminology and standard results concerning topological vector spaces, we refer to [5], [8], [12] and [14]; for notation, terminology and standard results concerning Riesz spaces and ordered algebraic systems, we refer to [3], [4], [6] , [9] and [16]. Here we establish some notational conventions for the rest of the paper. A partially ordered set X is called a *lattice* if the infimum and supremum of any pair of elements in X exist. A real vector space X is called an *ordered vector space* if its vector space structure is compatible with the order structure in a manner such that

(a) if $x \leq y$, then $x + z \leq y + z$ for any $z \in X$;

(b) if $x \leq y$, then $\lambda x \leq \lambda y$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$.

An ordered vector space is called a *Riesz space* (or a *vector lattice*) if it is also a lattice at the same time; in this case, $X^+ = \{x \in X \mid x \geq 0\}$ is called the *positive cone* of X and its elements are called *positive elements*. A Riesz space X is said to be *Dedekind complete* if every nonempty subset of X that is bounded from above has a supremum; X is said to be *Archimedean* if $x, y \in X^+$ and $nx < y$ for all $n \in N$ imply $x = 0$. A Dedekind complete Riesz space is Archimedean. A Riesz space X is said to have the *countable sup property* if for every subset Y of X whose supremum exists in X, there exists an at most countable subset Z of Y such that $\sup Y = \sup Z$ in X. A Dedekind complete Riesz space is said to be *super Dedekind complete* if it has the countable sup property. A vector subspace of a Riesz space is said to be a *Riesz subspace* if it is closed under the lattice operation $\vee$. A subset Y of a Riesz space X is said to be *solid* if $|x| \leq |y|$ and $y \in Y$ implies $x \in Y$. A solid vector subspace of a Riesz space is called an *ideal*. A net $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ is said to be *decreasing* if $\alpha \geq \beta$ implies $x_\alpha \leq x_\beta$. The notation $x_\alpha \downarrow x$ means $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ is a decreasing net and the infimum of the set $\{x_\alpha \mid \alpha \in A\}$ is x; the notation $x_\alpha \uparrow x$ should be interpreted similarly. A net $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ in a Riesz space X is said to be *order convergent* to an element $x \in X$, often written as $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{o} x$, if there exists another net $(y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ in X such that $|x_\alpha - x| \leq y_\alpha \downarrow 0$. A subset B of a Riesz space X is said to be *order closed* if a net $\{x_\alpha\}$ in B order-converges to $x_0 \in X$ implies that $x_0 \in B$. An order closed ideal is called a *band*.

A topology τ on a vector space X over a field K is called a *linear topology* or *vector topology* if the addition operation $(x, y) \mapsto x + y$ from $X \times X$

to X and the scalar multiplication operation $(\lambda, x) \mapsto \lambda x$ from $K \times X$ to X are both continuous. A *topological vector space* (X, τ) over a field K is a vector space X endowed with a vector topology τ. Unless otherwise stated, all topological vector spaces are assumed to be over R. A subset B of a topological vector space (X, τ) is said to be *topologically bounded* or *τ-bounded* if for every neighborhood V of zero there exists some $\lambda > 0$ such that $\lambda B \subset V$. A topological vector space (X, τ) is said to be *locally convex* if it has a neighborhood base at zero consisting of convex sets. A locally convex topological vector space is said to be *seminormable* (*normable*) if it can be generated by a single seminorm (norm). An *ordered topological vector space* is an ordered vector space equipped with a compatible vector topology. A *topological Riesz space* is an ordered topological vector space which is a Riesz space at the same time. A vector topology τ on a Riesz space X is said to be *locally solid* if there exists a τ-neighborhood base at zero consisting of solid sets. A *locally solid Riesz space* is a Riesz space equipped with a locally solid vector topology. A seminorm ρ on a Riesz space X is called a *Riesz seminorm* if $|x| \leq |y|$ implies $\rho(x) \leq \rho(y)$ for any two elements $x, y \in X$. A vector topology on a Riesz space is said to be *locally convex-solid* if it is both locally solid and locally convex. A *locally convex-solid Riesz space* is a Riesz space equipped with a locally convex-solid vector topology.

All operators in this paper are assumed to be linear; therefore, an operator means a linear operator. Let T be an operator between two ordered topological vector spaces (E_1, τ_1) and (E_2, τ_2). T is said to be a *positive operator* if it carries positive elements to positive elements; it is said to be *regular* if T can be written as the difference of two positive operators; it is said to be *order bounded* if it carries order bounded sets to order bounded sets; it is said to be *order continuous* if the net $(T(x_\alpha))$ is order convergent for every order-convergent net (x_α) in E_1; it is said to be *topologically bounded* if it maps τ_1-bounded sets to τ_2-bounded sets; it is said to be *topologically continuous* if $T^{-1}(O) \in \tau_1$ for every open set $O \in \tau_2$. A topologically continuous operator is topologically bounded. As already mentioned in Section 1, the collection of all topologically continuous operators between E_1 and E_2 is a vector space and will be denoted by $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$. Likewise, $\mathcal{L}_R(E_1, E_2)$ denotes the vector space of all regular operators between E_1 and E_2; $\mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$ denotes the vector space of all topologically bounded operators between E_1 and E_2; $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$ denotes the vector space of all order bounded operators between E_1 and E_2. The vector spaces $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2), \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ are all equipped with the ordering defined by $S \leq T$ if and only if $T - S$ is a positive operator, that is, $S(x) \le T(x)$ for all $x \in E_1^+$.

An additive group $(G, +)$ equipped with a partial order $\le$ is called a *partially ordered group* if its group operation is compatible with the order structure in a manner such that

(a) if $x \le y$, then $x + z \le y + z$ for any $z \in G$;

(b) if $x \le y$, then $z + x \le z + y$ for any $z \in G$.

A partially ordered group is said to be a *lattice-ordered group* if it is also a lattice at the same time. A field $(F, +, \cdot)$ equipped with a partial order $\le$ is called a *partially ordered field* if its field operations are compatible with the order structure in a manner such that

(a) if $x \le y$, then $x + z \le y + z$ for any $z \in G$;

(b) if $x > y$ and $z > 0$, then $x \cdot z > y \cdot z$;

(c) $1 > 0$, where 1 is the identity of F.

A partially ordered field is said to be a *lattice-ordered field* if its additive group is a lattice-ordered group.

3 Generalization of the Nakano-Roberts Theorem

First, we recall some results about the relationship between order bounded sets and topologically bounded sets in ordered topological vector spaces. A classical result says that an order bounded subset of a locally solid Riesz space must be topologically bounded.

Theorem 3.1 (Theorem 2.19 of [4])**.** *If (E, τ) is a locally solid Riesz space, then every order bounded subset of E is τ-bounded.*

Recently, [7] showed that if an order bounded topological vector space has an order bounded neighborhood of zero, then every topologically bounded subset must be order bounded.

Theorem 3.2 (Theorem 2.4 of [7])**.** *Let (E, τ) be an order topological vector space that has an order bounded τ-neighborhood of zero. Then very τ-bounded subset of E is order bounded.*

[10] and [11] first showed that the norm dual of a normed Riesz space is an ideal of its order dual; later [13] generalized this result to locally solid Riesz spaces but their terminology is of old-fashion. The following version, stated in the modern terminology of locally solid Riesz spaces, is taken from [4].

Theorem 3.3 (Nakano-Roberts)**.** *Let* (L, τ) *be a locally solid Riesz space. Then the topological dual* L' *of* (L, τ) *is an ideal of the order dual* $L^{\sim}$*.*

The Nakano-Roberts Theorem ensures that a continuous linear functional is necessarily order bounded. In view of this, one would naturally ask whether a topologically continuous operator is necessarily order bounded, that is, whether $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$ holds. The next example shows that the answer is negative.

Example 3.1. Let $E_1 = E_2 = R^2$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2$ be the usual norm topology on R^2. We equip E_1 with the lexicographic ordering, that is, for two points $x = (x_1, x_2)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2)$ in R^2 we define $x \leq y$ if and only if $x_1 < y_1$ or else $x_1 = y_1$ and $x_2 \leq y_2$. For E_2, we equip it with the usual pointwise ordering, that is, for two points $x = (x_1, x_2)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2)$ in R^2 we define $x \leq y$ if and only if $x_1 \leq y_1$ and $x_2 \leq y_2$. Take $x = (0, 0)$ and $y = (0, 1)$ in E_1. The order interval $B = [x, y]$ in E_1 is trivially order bounded. Consider the identity operator $T \equiv I$. Then $T \in \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ and $T(B) = B$. Since B contains infinitely many infinite vertical rays in R^2, B cannot be order bounded in E_2. Therefore, $T \notin \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$, showing that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2) \not\subset \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$.

Example 3.1 shows that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$ generally does not hold. It is also natural to ask whether $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ holds, that is, whether an order bounded operator is necessarily topologically continuous. The answer is also negative as evidenced by the next example.

Example 3.2. Let $E_1 = E_2$ be the space of all Lebesgue integrable functions on R. Let τ_1 be the norm topology generated by the L_1-norm $||x||_1 = \int_R |x(t)|dt$ and τ_2 be the weak topology $\sigma(E_2, E_2')$ on E_2. Equip both E_1 and E_2 with the usual pointwise ordering, that is, $x \leq y$ if and only if $x(t) \leq y(t)$ for all $t \in R$. Then the identity operator $T \equiv I$ between E_1 and E_2 is obviously order bounded. However, T is not topologically continuous. To see this, we notice that E_1 is an infinite-dimensional normed space; hence, the weak topology τ_2 is strictly weaker than the norm topology τ_1.

In summary, we have concluded that

$$\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2) \not\subset \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) \text{ and } \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) \not\subset \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2).$$

However, the following theorem shows that if E_1 is locally solid and E_2 has an order bounded τ_2-neighborhood, then $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is a vector subspace of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$.

Theorem 3.4 (Theorem 2.3 of [7])**.** *Suppose (E_1, τ_1) is a locally solid Riesz space and (E_2, τ_2) is an ordered topological vector space having an order bounded τ_2-neighborhood of zero. Then $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is a vector subspace of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$.*

Remark 1. Example 2.1 shows that the hypothesis that "τ_1 is locally solid" may not be dropped; that is, Theorem 3.4 need not hold if τ_1 is not locally solid.

Remark 2. The hypothesis "(E_2, τ_2) has an order bounded τ_2-neighborhood of zero" cannot be dropped either even if both τ_1 and τ_2 are locally-convex solid. The following example illustrates this point.

Example 3.3. Let $E_1 = E_2 = D[-\pi, \pi]$ be the space of all the differentiable functions on $[-\pi, \pi]$. Take $\tau_1 = \tau_2$ to be the norm topology generated by the sup norm $||x||_\infty = \sup_{-\pi \leq t \leq \pi} |x(t)|$. Equip E_1 with the usual pointwise ordering; equip E_2 with the ordering defined as follows: for $x, y \in E_2$ we say $x \leq y$ if and only if $x(t) \leq y(t)$ and $x'(t) \leq y'(t)$ for all t in $[-\pi, \pi]$.It is evident that $|| \cdot ||_\infty$ is a Riesz norm on both E_1 and E_2; hence τ_1 and τ_2 are both locally convex-solid. Consider the identity operator $T \equiv I$ which is trivially topologically continuous. We claim that T is not order bounded. To see this, take $B = \{\cos kt\}_{k \in N}$ in E_1. Then B is contained in the order interval $[-1, 1]$ in E_1; hence it is order bounded in E_1. Suppose there exist two elements x and y in E_2 such that $B = T(B)$ is contained in the order interval $[x, y]$ in E_2. Then we would have $k = \sup_{-\pi \leq t \leq \pi} |k \sin kt| \leq \sup_{-\pi \leq t \leq \pi} \max\{x(t), y(t)\}$ for all $k \in N$, which is impossible. Thus, $B = T(B)$ is not order bounded in E_2. This shows that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2) \not\subset \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. Since B is contained in the open unit ball $U = \{x \in E_2 \mid ||x||_\infty < 1\}$ of E_2, this also implies that E_2 does not have an order bounded τ_2-neighborhood of zero.

We would also like to point out that the sufficient condition in Theorem 3.4 is not necessary. The next example shows that it is possible to have $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$ with τ_1 and τ_2 both being locally-convex solid but L_2 does not have an order bounded τ_2-bounded neighborhood of zero.

Example 3.4. Let $E_1 = E_2$ be the space of all real-valued continuous functions defined on R and $\tau_1 = \tau_2$ be the compact-open topology. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be the family of all compact subsets of R. For each $K \subset \mathcal{K}$, we define $\rho_K(x) = \sup_{t \in K} |x(t)|$ for $x \in E_1 = E_2$. Then $\tau_1 = \tau_2$ is generated by the family of seminorms $\{\rho_K(x)\}_{K \in \mathcal{K}}$. Therefore, $\tau_1 = \tau_2$ is locally convex. We equip $E_1 = E_2$ with the usual pointwise ordering. Then each ρ_K is clearly a Riesz seminorm; it follows that $\tau_1 = \tau_2$ is locally convex-solid. Let $T \in \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ and B be an order bounded subset of E_1. Then Theorem 3.1 shows that B is τ_1-bounded; hence, $T(B)$ is τ_2-bounded. As a subset B of E_2 is τ_2-bounded if and only if $\rho_K(B)$ is bounded for every compact subset $K \in \mathcal{K}$ (p. 109 of [8]), we know $T(B)$ is τ_2-bounded. However, E_2 cannot have an order bounded τ_2-neighborhood of zero because it is known that (E_2, τ_2) has no τ_2-bounded neighborhood (Example 6.1.7 of [12]).

In view of the Nakano-Roberts Theorem, the next question would naturally be whether the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4 is sufficient to imply that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. The answer is still negative as we can see from the next example.

Example 3.5. Let $D[0, 2\pi]$ denote the family of all differentiable functions on $[0, 2\pi]$. Put $E_1 = E_2 = D[0, 2\pi] \times D[0, 2\pi]$ with $\tau_1 = \tau_2$ being the norm topology generated by $||(x_1, x_2)|| = ||x_1||_\infty + ||x_2||_\infty$, where $||x(t)||_\infty = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 2\pi} |x(t)|$ is the sup norm. Equip E_1 with the ordering defined as follows: for any two points $x = (x_1, x_2)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2)$ in E_1 we define $x \leq y$ if and only if $x_1(t) \leq y_1(t)$ and $x_2(t) \leq y_2(t)$ for all $t \in [0, 2\pi]$. Then $|| \cdot ||$ is a Riesz norm on E_1; hence (E_1, τ_1) is a locally-convex solid Riesz space. For E_2, we equip it with the following ordering: for any two points $x = (x_1, x_2)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2)$ in E_2 we define $x \leq y$ if and only if $x_1(t) < y_1(t)$ for all $t \in [0, 2\pi]$ or else $x_1(t) = y_1(t)$ and $x_2(t) \leq y_2(t)$ for all $t \in [0, 2\pi]$. It is clear that E_2 has an order-bounded τ_2-neighborhood of zero. Consider the operators S and T from E_1 to E_2 defined by

$$\begin{aligned} S: &\quad (x_1, x_2) \mapsto (0, x_2'); \\ T: &\quad (x_1, x_2) \mapsto (x_2, 0). \end{aligned}$$

where x' denotes the derivative of x. It is evident that T is order bounded and topologically continuous. In view of the ordering on E_2, we easily see that $|S| \leq |T|$. Notice that the image of any point $x = (x_1, x_2) \in E_1$ under S is contained in the order interval $[(-1, 0), (1, 0)]$ in E_2. Therefore, S is order bounded. However, S is not topologically continuous. To see this, consider the sequence $\{(0, (\sin kt)/k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ in E_1. We have $(0, (\sin kt)/k) \xrightarrow{\tau_1} 0$; but $S((0, (\sin kt)/k)) = (0, \cos kt) \overset{\tau_2}{\not\rightarrow} 0$. Thus, $S \notin \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$, showing that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is not an ideal of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$.

With some extra assumption in addition to the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4, we can ensure that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. It turns out one such an extra assumption is "(E_2, τ_2) is a Dedekind complete locally solid Riesz space". Now we establish this result as the generalization of the Nakano-Roberts-type theorem.

Theorem 3.5 (The Generalized Nakano-Roberts Theorem)**.** *Suppose* (E_1, τ_1) *is a locally solid Riesz space and* (E_2, τ_2) *is a Dedekind complete locally solid Riesz space having an order bounded* τ_2*-neighborhood of zero. Then* $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ *is an ideal of* $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$*.*

Proof. Theorem 3.4 shows that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is vector subspace of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$ under the hypothesis. Therefore, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is solid subset of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. To this end, assume that $S \in \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$ and $T \in \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ with $|S| \leq |T|$. Let $\{x_\alpha\}$ be a net in E_1 such that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\tau_1} 0$. We shall show that $S(x_\alpha) \xrightarrow{\tau_2} 0$. For any element ϵ in $E_2^+ \backslash \{0\}$, the Riesz-Kantorovich Theorem (Theorem 1.18 of [3]) implies that there exists another net $\{y_\alpha\} \in E_1$ such that $|y_\alpha| \leq |x_\alpha|$ and $|T(x_\alpha)| \leq |T(y_\alpha)| + \epsilon$. Thus, we have

$$|S(x_\alpha)| \leq |S|(|x_\alpha|) \leq |T|(|x_\alpha|) \leq |T(y_\alpha)| + \epsilon. \tag{1}$$

Also, the local solidness of τ_1 implies $y_\alpha \xrightarrow{\tau_1} 0$. Therefore, $T(y_\alpha) \xrightarrow{\tau_2} 0$, that is, for any τ_2-neighborhood V of zero there exists an index α_V such that $T(y_\alpha) \in V$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_V$. It follows from Equation (1) and the local solidness of τ_2 that $S(x_\alpha) \in V + \epsilon$ for $\alpha \geq \alpha_V$. Since E_2 is Archimedean, we have that $S(x_\alpha) \in V$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_V$, that is, $S(x_\alpha) \xrightarrow{\tau_2} 0$. This proves that $S \in \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is a solid subset of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$.

□

Remark. Under the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4 $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is itself a Dedekind complete Riesz space. The next theorem shows that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is a super Dedekind complete Riesz space with some slightly stronger assumptions.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose* (E_1, τ_1) *is a separable locally solid Riesz space and* (E_2, τ_2) *is a super Dedekind complete locally solid Riesz space having an order bounded* τ_2*-neighborhood of zero. Then* $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ *is a super Dedekind complete Riesz space.*

Proof. In view of Theorem 3.5, we only need to show that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ has the countable sup property. Let $D = \{x_1, ..., x_n, ...\}$ be a dense subset of E_1 and $\{T_\alpha\}$ be a net in $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ such that $T_\alpha \downarrow 0$. By the Riesz-Kantorovich Theorem, there exists a net $\{\beta_\alpha\}$ of E_2 such that $\beta_\alpha \downarrow 0$ and $T_\alpha(|x_n|) \leq \beta_\alpha$ for all α and all x_n. Since E_2 is super Dedekind complete, we have an increasing sequence of indices $\{\alpha_m\}$ such that $\beta_{\alpha_m} \downarrow 0$. Now for each $m \in N$ take α_m such that $T_{\alpha_m}(|x_n|) \leq \beta_{\alpha_m}$ for all $n = 1, ..., m$. Let $0 \leq T \leq T_{\alpha_m}$ for all $m \in N$. Then for a given n and all $m \leq n$ we have

$$0 \leq |T(x_n)| \leq T(|x_n|) \leq T_{\alpha_m}(|x_n|) < \beta_{\alpha_m},$$

implying that $T \equiv 0$ on D. Since D is dense in E_1, we have $T \equiv 0$ on E_1, proving that $T_{\alpha_m} \downarrow 0$ in $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ has the countable sup property.

□

Corollary 3.1. *Suppose* (E_1, τ_1) *is a second countable or metrizable locally solid Riesz space and* (E_2, τ_2) *is a super Dedekind complete locally solid Riesz space having an order bounded* τ_2*-neighborhood of zero. Then* $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ *is a super Dedekind complete Riesz space.*

4 Bands in the space of order bounded operators

Theorem 3.5 gives a condition for $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ to be an ideal of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. The next example shows that the hypothesis of Theorem 3.5 is not sufficient for $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ to be a σ-ideal or a band of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. (Example 2.23 of [4] may also serve this purpose.)

Example 4.1. Let E_1 be the space of real sequences that are eventually zero. We equip E_1 with the usual pointwise ordering and the norm topology τ_1 generated by the sup norm $||x||_\infty = \sup_{n\geq 1} |x_n|$ for $x = x_n \in E_1$; let E_2 be R equipped with the usual ordering and the usual Euclidean norm topology τ_2. Then (E_1, τ_1) and (E_2, τ_2) are both locally convex-solid Riesz spaces and E_2 is Dedekind complete with an order bounded τ_2-neighborhood of zero. Consider a sequence of linear functionals $\{f_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ defined by

$$f_n(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} |x_k| \quad \text{for } x = \{x_n\} \text{ in } E_1.$$

Let f be the linear functional defined by

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |x_k| \quad \text{for } x = \{x_n\} \text{ in } E_1.$$

It is clear that each f_n is continuous and order bounded, f is order bounded, and $f_n \uparrow f$. Take $x_n = (0, ..., 0, 1/n, 1/(n+1), ..., 1/(2n), ...)$ in E_1. Then $x_n \xrightarrow{\tau_1} 0$. Since $f(x_n) = \sum_{k=n}^{2n} 1/k$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} f(x_n) = \lim_{a\downarrow 0^+} \int_a^1 x^{-1} dx = +\infty.$$

This shows that f is not continuous. Therefore, $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is not a σ-ideal or a band of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$.

The following theorem gives a sufficient condition for L' to be a band of L .

Theorem 4.1 (Theorem 2.29 of [4])**.** *If (E, τ) is a barrelled locally convex-solid Riesz space, then the topological dual L' is a band in the order dual L .*

We attempt to generalize Theorem 4.1 by searching a condition under which $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is a band of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. First, we point out that Theorem 4.1 does not extend naively to our general setup, as the next example shows.

Example 4.2. Suppose $E_1 = E_2$ is the space of all integrable functions on $[0, 1]$, where two almost everywhere equal functions are consider equivalent, that is, $E_1 = E_2$ is the space of equivalence classes of almost everywhere equal functions. Let τ_1 be the norm topology generated by the L^1-norm on $[0, 1]$, i.e., $||x||_1 = \int_0^1 |x(t)|dt$; let τ_2 be the weak topology $\sigma(E_2, E_2')$ on E_2. We equip E_1 and E_2 with the usual pointwise ordering. Then $|| \cdot ||_1$ is a Riesz norm; hence τ_1 is locally convex-solid. Also, since the space $L^1[0, 1]$ is a Fr*é*chet space, E_1 is barrelled. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the collection of all finite subsets of $[0, 1]$ and for each $\alpha \subset \mathcal{A}$ define an operator from E_1 to E_2 as follows:

$$T_\alpha(x) = x(t)1_\alpha(t),$$

where 1_α is the indicator function of α. It is evident that $T_\alpha \equiv 0$ for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$; hence each T_α is trivially order bounded and topologically continuous. Also, $T_\alpha \uparrow T \equiv I$, where I is the identity operator between E_1 and E_2. Clearly, T is order bounded. As $L^1[0, 1]$ is an infinite-dimensional normed space, the norm topology τ_1 is strictly stronger than the weak topology τ_2. It follows that T is not topologically continuous. Therefore, $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is not a band of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$.

Next, we attempt to generalize Theorem 4.1, that is, we seek a condition for $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ to be a band of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. To this end, we need to slightly generalize some basic concepts. Usually a topological vector space is defined over a field K which is assumed to be either R or C. [5] defines a topological vector space over a valued division ring. For the rest of this section, we define a *topological vector space* X to be a topological space which is also a vector space over a Dedekind complete lattice-ordered field K such that the addition operation $(x, y) \mapsto x + y$ from $X \times X$ to X and the scalar operation $(\lambda, x) \mapsto \lambda x$ from $K \times X$ to X are both continuous. Then the corresponding notions of absorbing sets, balanced/circled sets, convex sets, etc may be generalized in the obvious way; for example, we say a subset B of X is *balanced* if for all $x \in B$ and $\lambda \in K$ with $|\lambda| \leq 1$ we have $\lambda x \in B$, where 1 is the identity of the lattice-ordered field K.

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose* (E_1, τ_1) *is a barrelled locally convex-solid Riesz space and* (E_2, τ_2) *is a Dedekind completely locally solid lattice-ordered field over itself with an order bounded* τ_2*-neighborhood of zero. Then* $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ *is a band of* $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$*.*

Proof. Since the hypothesis of Theorem 4.1 is satisfied, we know $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. Thus, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is order closed in $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. To this end, we assume that $\{T_\alpha\}$ is a net in $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ such that $0 \leq T_\alpha \uparrow T$ in $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. Put

$$V = \{x \in E_1 \mid |T_\alpha(x)| \leq 1 \text{ for all } \alpha\},$$

where 1 is the identity of E_2. We claim that V is absorbing, balanced, convex and τ_1-closed. First, let $x \in E_1$. If $|T(x)| = 0$, then V is trivially absorbing. Otherwise, let β be the inverse of $|T(x)|$ in E_2. Then for all α and $|\lambda| \leq \beta$ we have

$$|T_\alpha(\lambda x)| = |\lambda T_\alpha(x)| \leq |\beta||T(x)| = 1,$$

showing that V is absorbing. Also, for any $x \in V$ and $\lambda \in E_2$ with $\lambda \in [-1, 1]$ we have

$$|T_\alpha(\lambda x)| = |\lambda||T_\alpha(x)| \leq |T_\alpha(x)| \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } \alpha.$$

Hence, V is balanced. Next, take $\beta \in E_2$ with $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ and $x, y \in V$. Then for each α we have

$$|T_\alpha(\beta x + (1 - \beta)y)| \leq \beta|T_\alpha(x)| + (1 - \beta)|T_\alpha(y)| \leq 1.$$

Thus, V is convex. Finally, if $\{x_\beta\}$ is a net in E_1 with $x_\beta \xrightarrow{\tau_1} x$, then for all α we have

$$|T_\alpha(x_\beta)| \xrightarrow{\tau_2} |T_\alpha(x)| \leq 1,$$

implying that V is τ_1-closed. Therefore, V is a τ_1-neighborhood of zero. Since $T(V)$ is order bounded and τ_2 is locally solid, $T(V)$ is τ_2-bounded. Thus, for any τ_2-neighborhood U of zero there exists some element λ in $E_2^+ \backslash \{0\}$ such that $T(V) \subset \lambda U$ which implies

$$T\left(\lambda^{-1} V\right) = \lambda^{-1} T(V) \subset U.$$

Since $\lambda^{-1}V$ is still a τ_1-neighborhood of zero, we have $T \in \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$. This shows that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ is order closed in $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. □

5 Relationship between $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$, $\mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$.

In this section, we further investigate the relationship between $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$, $\mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$. Example 2.8 of [7] shows that an order bounded operator need not be topologically bounded, that is, $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$ in general does not hold. On the other hand, Example 2.7 of [7] shows that $\mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$ in general does not hold either. The following theorem gives sufficient conditions for the two spaces to coincide, i.e., $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$.

Theorem 5.1. *For $i = 1, 2$, let (E_i, τ_i) be a locally solid Riesz space.*

- *(i) If for $i = 1, 2$, the space (E_i, τ_i) has an order bounded τ_i-neighborhood of zero, then the space of order bounded operators coincide with the space of locally bounded operators, that is, $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$.*
- *(ii) If the hypothesis of (i) holds and (E_2, τ_2) is also Dedekind complete, then $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_R(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$.*
- *(iii) If for $i = 1, 2$, (E_i, τ_i) has a nonempty interior of the positive cone E_i^+, then $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$.*
- *(iv) If the hypothesis of (iii) holds and E_2 is also Dedekind complete, then $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_R(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$.*

Proof. (i) Take any $T \in \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. Let A be a τ_1-bounded subset of E_1. Then Theorem 3.2 shows that A is order bounded. Thus, $T(A)$ is order bounded. Now invoke Theorem 3.1 to conclude that $T(A)$ is τ_2-bounded. Therefore, $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$. On the other hand, take any $T \in \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$. Let B be an order bounded subset of E_1. Then Theorem 3.1 shows that B is τ_1-bounded. Thus, $T(B)$ is τ_2-bounded. Now invoke Theorem 3.2 to conclude that $T(B)$ is order bounded. Therefore, $T \in \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$, proving that $\mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$.

(ii) Since E_2 is Dedekind complete, we have $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_R(E_1, E_2)$. From the proof of (i), we see that $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$ holds in this case. Therefore, the conclusion follows.

(iii) Take an element x from the interior of E_1^+ and a circled neighborhood V of zero such that $x + V \subset E_1^+$. Then $x - V \subset E_1^+$. Hence, V is contained in the order interval $[-x, x]$, implying that $[-x, x]$ itself is a τ_1-neighborhood of zero. Similarly, E_2 has an order bounded τ_2-neighborhood. It follows from (i) that $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$.

(iv) Similar to (ii).

$\square$

Next, we give conditions for the three spaces $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$, $\mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ to coincide.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose* (E_1, τ_1) *is an order topological vector space with an order bounded* τ_1*-neighborhood of zero and* (E_2, τ_2) *is a locally solid Riesz space. If any of the following conditions is satisfied, then* $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$.

(i) (E_1, τ_1) *has a countable neighborhood base at zero.*

(ii) For $i = 1, 2$, (E_i, τ_i) *has a* τ_i*-bounded convex neighborhood of zero.*

(iii) For $i = 1, 2$, (E_i, τ_i) *is a locally convex Hausdorff space and has a topologically bounded neighborhood of zero.*

(iv) (E_1, τ_1) *is bornological and* (E_2, τ_2) *is locally convex.*

Proof. First, note that Theorem 3.4 shows that $\mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$. Hence, it suffices to establish that $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$ for each case.

(i) Since (E_1, τ_1) has a countable neighborhood base at zero, it is pseudometrizable. Thus, we have $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$.

(ii) A topological vector space with a topologically bounded convex neighborhood of zero is seminormed. Therefore, (E_1, τ_1) and (E_2, τ_2) are both seminormable. In this case, we have $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$.

(iii) A locally Hausdorff space is normable if and only if it has a topologically bounded neighorhood of zero. It follows that (E_1, τ_1) and (E_2, τ_2) are both normable. Hence, $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$.

(iv) This follows from the fact that the class of bornological spaces is the class of locally convex spaces (E_1, τ_1) such that all topologically bounded operators from (E_1, τ_1) to a locally convex space (E_2, τ_2) are topologically continuous. Therefore, we also have $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) \subset \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$.

□

Corollary 5.1. *For $i = 1, 2$, let (E_i, τ_i) be a locally solid Riesz space. Suppose any of the four conditions in Theorem 5.2 holds.*

(i) If for $i = 1, 2$, (E_i, τ_i) has an order bounded τ_i-neighborhood of zero, then $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$.

(ii) If the hypothesis of (i) holds and E_2 is also Dedekind complete, then $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_R(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$.

(iii) If for $i = 1, 2$, (E_i, τ_i) is a locally solid Riesz space with a nonempty interior of the positive cone E_i^+, then $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$.

(iv) If the hypothesis of (iii) holds and E_2 is also Dedekind complete, then $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_R(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TB}(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_{TC}(E_1, E_2)$.

Remark 1. If the hypothesis of Corollary 5.1 holds, then we have several interesting results: (i) every topologically bounded operator can be written as the difference of two positive operators; (ii) every positive operator is topologically continuous, and so on.

Remark 2. Let $\mathcal{L}_n(E_1, E_2)$ denote the space of all order-continuous operators between E_1 and E_2. Then $\mathcal{L}_n(E_1, E_2)$ is a band of $\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2)$ when E_2 is Dedekind complete and the Riesz-Kantorovich Theorem implies

$$\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_n(E_1, E_2) \oplus \mathcal{L}_n^d(E_1, E_2).$$

Therefore, if the hypothesis of Corollary 5.1 holds, then every topologically bounded or topologically continuous operator can be decomposed as the sum of an order continuous operator and an operator in $\mathcal{L}_n^d(E_1, E_2)$.

Remark 3. Similar to Remark 2, when E_2 is Dedekind complete, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_B(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{L}_C(E_1, E_2) \oplus \mathcal{L}_S(E_1, E_2),$$

where $\mathcal{L}_C(E_1, E_2)$ is the space of all σ-continuous operators and $\mathcal{L}_S(E_1, E_2)$ is the space of all singular operators. It follows that if the hypothesis of Corollary 5.1 holds, then every topologically bounded or topologically continuous operator can be decomposed as the sum of a σ-order continuous operator and a singular operator.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Gerard Buskes for his encouragement.

References

[1] Aliprantis, C.D. (1975). On order properties of order bounded transformations, *Can. J. Math.*, XXVII (3), 666-678.

[2] Aliprantis, C.D. and Burkinshaw, O. (1983). On positive order continuous operators, *Indag. Math.*, 86 (1), 1-6.

[3] Aliprantis, C.D. and Burkinshaw, O. (1985). *Positive Operators*, Springer, Berlin, New York.

[4] Aliprantis, C.D. and Burkinshaw, O. (2003). *Locally Solid Riesz Spaces with Applications to Economics*, Second Edition, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island.

[5] Bourbaki, N. (1987). *Elements of Mathematics: Topological Vector Spaces*, Chapters 1-5, Springer, Berlin, New York.

[6] Fuchs, L. (1963). *Partially Ordered Algebraic Systems*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, New York.

[7] Hong, L. (2015). On order bounded subsets of locally solid Riesz spaces, *Quaestiones Mathematicae*, to appear, http://arxiv.org/abs/1401.6095.

[8] Horváth, J. (1966). *Topological Vector Spaces and Distributions*. Vol. I, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts.

[9] Luxemburg, W.A.J. and Zaanen, A.C. (1971). *Riesz Spaces, I*, North-Holland, Amsterdam.

[10] Nakano, H. (1950). *Modulared Semi-ordered Linear Spaces*, Maruzen Co., Tokyo.

[11] Nakano, H. (1966). *Linear Lattices*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, MI.

[12] Narici, L. and Beckenstein, E. (2011). *Topological Vector Spaces*, Second Edition, CRC Press, Boca Raton.

[13] Roberts, G.T. (1952). Topologies in vector lattices, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.*, 48, 533-546.

[14] Schaefer, H.H., (1974). *Toploogical Vector Spaces*, Springer, Berlin, New York.

[15] Schaefer, H.H. (1989). On order continuous linear operators, *Indag. Math.*, 92 (4), 479-483.

[16] Zaanen, A. (1997). *Introduction to Operator Theory in Riesz Spaces*, Springer, Berlin, New York.